



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,423	02/20/2001	Hong-Sung Song	8733.400.00	1942

7590

12/18/2002

LONG ALDRIDE & NORMAN LLP
701 PENNSYLAANIA AVENUE,N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

MOHANDESI, JILA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3728

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/785,423

Applicant(s)

SONG ET AL. 

Examiner

Jila M Mohandesi

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chenoweth (6,076,681) in view of Hashimoto (6,297,964). Chenoweth '681 discloses a tape carrier package film for electronic components, comprising: a tape carrier package part (plastic strip 10) having a mounting portion for a driving integrated circuit, wherein the tape carrier part is defined by a depression (11) on the package film, a peripheral part having a plurality of sprocket holes (31, 32) and a plurality of punching holes (51, 52, 53, 54), said punching holes will inherently reduce connection between the tape carrier package part and the peripheral part. See Figure 3 embodiment. Chenoweth is silent about whether the tape carrier package is a package film. Hashimoto '964 is cited merely as an example that it is old and conventional to make tape carrier packages from package film. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the tape carrier package of Chenoweth '681 from package film as taught by Hashimoto '964, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

With respect to claims 4, 8, 10 and 11, see the supporter (44) between triangular punching holes (51) and (52) and supporter (45) between triangular punching holes (53) and (54) in Figure 5 embodiment.

With respect to claims 2, 6 and 7 and the shape and location of the punching holes, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the shape and location of the punching holes, since applicant has not disclosed that changing the shape of the punching holes solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any punching hole.

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda `370 in view of Hashimoto `964. Honda `370 discloses a tape carrier package film (synthetic resin carrier tape 30`) for electronic components, comprising: a tape carrier package part having a mounting portion for a driving integrated circuit, wherein the tape carrier part is defined by a depression (recess 34`) on the package film , a peripheral part having a plurality of sprocket holes (36`); and a plurality of punching holes (34b`) which inherently reduce connection between the tape carrier package part and the peripheral part. See Figure 4 embodiment. Honda `370 is silent about whether the tape carrier package is a package film. Hashimoto `964 is cited merely as an example that it is old and conventional to make tape carrier packages from package film. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the tape carrier package of Chenoweth `681 from package film as taught by Hashimoto `964, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

With respect to claims 4, 10 and 11, see the supporter between elongated punching holes (34b') in Figure 4 embodiment.

With respect to claims 2, 6 and 7 and the shape and location of the punching holes, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the shape and location of the punching holes, since applicant has not disclosed that changing the shape of the punching holes solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any punching hole.

With respect to claims 15-17, see column 3, lines 32-34.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shown are tape carrier packages analogous to applicant's instant invention.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Telephone inquiries regarding the status of application or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information "should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the Examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without contacting the examiners", M.P.E.P. 203.08. The Group clerical receptionist number is (703) 308-1148 or the Tech Center 3700 Customer Service Center number is (703) 306-5648. For applicant's convenience, the Group Technological Center FAX number is (703) 872-9302. (Note that the Examiner cannot confirm receipt of faxes) Please identify Examiner Mohandesi of Art Unit 3728 at the top of your cover sheet of any correspondence submitted. Inquiries only concerning the merits of the examination should be directed to Jila Mohandesi whose telephone number is (703) 305-7015. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:00 (EST).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on (703) 308-2672.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g. copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, for PTO-892, etc. requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Valerie Douglas at (703) 308-1337.

Check out our web-site at "www.uspto.gov" for fees and other useful information.

Jila M Mohandesi
Examiner
Art Unit 3728

JMM
December 12, 2002



M.D. Patterson
Primary Examiner